

*Linda Tuxen & Rinal report to Grevatt*  
*On perchlorate*

Catherine McCracken 01/26/99 10:31 AM

To: Peter Grevatt/DC/USEPA/US@EPA  
cc: Dorothy Canter/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Kevin Mayer/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Lois Grunwald/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
Subject: Re: Peer review registration

Peter,

Welcome back and congratulations on the newest addition to the Grevatt family!

Regarding the email on peer review registration. In your absence, I did ask Ella to just send me the numbers on registration so that here in Region 9 we can start to get a sense of how large this meeting will be and how best to support the external peer review meeting. I do recognize that you are the lead for this effort, and my apologies if the RTI request was beyond what was appropriate. However, in order for us to assist, there is certain information which Region 9 does need to be provided. I have listed out a number of points below. Please let me know if we should have a conference call to go through these points and make sure we are all on the same page with roles/responsibilities for this meeting.

Specifically:

1. A copy of the agenda for the peer review meeting (we are getting questions about this and our press office will too),

2. It may be helpful to have a bit more information available to the press about the members of the peer review panel. Specifically, in addition to the names, affiliations, and specialty areas from the chart put together for the perchlorate web site, it would probably be useful to have the following additional information about each member of the peer review panel: degrees, significant papers, professional affiliations that are relevant to the issue, any additional information that you feel would be useful. My understanding is that RTI has full CVs for each panel member, so that it would not be a huge task to put together this information.

3. Logistical needs for the meeting. Dorothy and I spoke last week about the physical set-up in San Bernardino and how best to arrange registration tables etc. and also how to tell participants about the ground rules for this type of meeting, and protocols on providing information to the panel. One option that I discussed with Dorothy would be to put together a registration confirmation letter to be sent out ASAP after 1/31. This may be especially helpful for those who do plan to address remarks to the panel. It seems that these speakers need to know the following:

-Comments will be limited to 5 minutes (if that is the case), and first priority goes to those who have indicated they will make comments (if that is the case). If you are going to be flexible about accepting non-registered speakers after going through registered speakers, you may want to decide how that will work and communicate this in the letter.

-We may want to urge them to prepare a written statement to read to the panel and then provide a copy to the RTI contact at the meeting. If speakers are supposed to bring along sufficient copies of their statement to provide one copy to each panel member, they need to be told that in advance of the meeting. The other option is that if they provide one hard copy to the RTI contact, copies would be made by RTI for the panel.

I recommend determining the mechanism for this second option before the meeting. As you know, I ran into tremendous reimbursement problems from the Henderson stakeholders forum and to date, have yet to be reimbursed.

-At the stakeholders forums, I know that you were concerned when information was

*Lois/Kevin  
available  
all day  
Thursday  
Am 907  
9-12*

*Do you  
want  
this?*

being passed out to participants, either in the forum, or left on seats (as was the case in Phoenix). The only way that I think we can prevent this from happening again is to formally designate a table, or perhaps area at the back of the room to be used as an information exchange table. Again, participants need to be told in advance of the meeting that this is the only place where distribution of information will be allowed, and that those who wish to pass out information are responsible for bringing their own copies to leave on the table. It seems that EPA is responsible only to provide copies to the peer review panel.

-All registered participants are observers at the meeting and are there to observe, not participate in the panel's discussions.

-Other considerations/ground rules which you and Dorothy feel are important to mention.

4. On the last conference call, I agreed to draft a Frequently Asked Questions. I will use the desktop statement as a starting point, but to date, have not received that document. If I receive the document by tomorrow, I will have something for people to review by COB Friday.

**You need to let me know as soon as possible if you prefer to do the FAQ yourself. If you want me to still do, you need to tell me who you feel are the appropriate reviewers.** I will try to find out the status of this document from Linda Tuxen.

*Dorothy Canter, Peter Grevatt, Annie Jarabek, Mike Osinski, Kevin Mayer*

5. Re: laptops for the meeting. My section has two laptops and I believe I will be able to reserve them to bring to San Bernardino. Kevin has also lined up two laptops to bring for the panel's use. Please let us know if there is anything but word processing capability required by you and/or the panel members. Please note that all we have are the laptops, so if printing a document is required, you may need to ask RTI to plan for this. The Radisson Hotel may have a business center which could provide this service - please let me know if you would additional information about availability and cost, and I would be happy to check into it.

6. Re: talking to the press. We need to decide which EPA staff will speak to the press at the meeting on which topics. I made it clear to Dan Rogers during the conference call that even though Larry Glidewell is attending the meeting, he is not to handle any press related to the external peer review meeting--as we have agreed that will be handled by Lois Grunwald of the Region 9 press office. This, of course, does not preclude the possibility that Larry will be talking to the press about the USAF's involvement on the IPSC and work on perchlorate issues. My recommendations for designated EPA staff: Peter Grevatt and Dorothy Canter (external peer review process/next steps on OSWER policy related to perchlorate), Annie Jarabek and Bill Farland (NCEA assessment document/internal peer review process), Kevin Mayer (perchlorate occurrence/treatment technologies work/analytical work), Mike Osinski (regulatory status and EPA plans).

Please let me know if you have any questions. You can reach me at 415/744-2182.

Thank you,  
Catherine

----- Forwarded by Catherine McCracken/R9/USEPA/US on 01/26/99 09:45 AM

Catherine McCracken 01/26/99 09:31 AM

To: sbg@rti.org  
cc: Peter Grevatt/DC/USEPA/US@EPA  
Subject: Re: Peer review registration

Thank you for your message. I will discuss this issue with Peter.